

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-14. In previous responses, Claims 6-7 and 10-13 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and Claim 14 was withdrawn. In the pending Final Rejection, the Examiner has indicated that Claim 1 has insufficient antecedent basis for a limitation in the claim and Claims 2 and 5 are incomplete. In response, the Applicants have amended Claim 1 and canceled Claims 2 and 5 without prejudice or disclaimer solely in response to this rejection. As such, the claims have been amended only to place them in condition for allowance and no new material has been added. No other claims have been amended, canceled, or added. Accordingly, Claims 1, 3-4, and 8-9 are currently pending in the application and in condition for allowance.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-5 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-5 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and clearly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner has rejected Claim 1 because the term "the surface of the second portion" does not have a sufficient antecedent basis. In response, the Applicants have amended the term in Claim 1 to provide a proper antecedent basis. As such, Claim 1 now complies with the requirements of §112, second paragraph. The Examiner has further rejected Claims 2 and 5 as being incomplete for omitting essential structure cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections, the structural cooperative relationships being how the top planar surface is contactable with a planar backside of a wafer when pads are present and/or the wafer may be disposed on the plurality of pads

and contacting the top planar surface of the first portion. In response, the Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the limitation of the plurality of pads in dependent Claims 2 and 5 on the top planar surface. As a result, as noted above, dependent Claims 2 and 5 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §112, second paragraph rejection of Claims 1-5 and 8-9 and allow issuance of the pending claims.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,841,624 to Xu, *et al.* (hereinafter "Xu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,106,630 to Frankel (hereinafter "Frankel"), U.S. Patent No. 6,146,504 to Patadia, *et al.* (hereinafter "Patadia"), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0029895 by Hanamachi, *et al.* (hereinafter "Hanamachi"). The rejection of Claims 2 and 5, however, are now moot since, as noted above, dependent Claims 2 and 5 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. With respect to the balance of the rejected claims, the Applicants respectfully disagree since the cited portions of the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi, as applied by the Examiner, do not teach or suggest a surface of a second portion of a removable, detachable pedestal slip cover parallel to and located below a top surface of a first portion of the removable, detachable pedestal slip cover that includes a peripheral circumferential groove as recited in independent Claim 1.

The Applicants fail to find where the Examiner addresses the second portion of the removable, detachable pedestal slip cover or asserts the cited portions of the cited combination of

Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi teach or suggest the limitation "wherein a surface of the second portion is parallel to and located below the top planar surface of the first portion and includes a peripheral circumferential groove" as recited in presently amended independent Claim 1. In addressing the circumferential groove which is included in the claimed second portion of the removable, detachable pedestal slip cover, the Examiner recognizes that Xu and Frankel fail to teach the pedestal cover defining a peripheral groove therein in a upper surface of the second surface, wherein a circumference of the wafer extends radially inwardly of the groove and cites Patadia to cure this deficiency of Xu and Frankel. (See Final Rejection of December 15, 2008, page 5.) Fig. 3 of Patadia, a partial sectional view of a substrate receiving portion of a support member 142, teaches an upper surface 156 of the support member. (See, e.g., lines 38-43 of column 6 and Fig. 3 of Patadia.) Fig. 9 of Patadia, a partial sectional view of a peripheral portion of a substrate member 110, teaches a channel 116 disposed around a perimeter of a substrate receiving surface. (See, e.g., line 66 of column 7 through line 3 of column 8 and Figs. 3-9 of Patadia.) However, the Examiner does not assert, as noted above, nor do the Applicants find where Patadia teaches or suggests a first or second portion. Assuming *arguendo* the peripheral portion of the substrate member of Patadia is the claimed second portion, the Applicants fail to find where the top surface of the peripheral portion of the substrate member is parallel to and located below the top planar surface of a first portion of the support member. As such, the Examiner has failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claim 1.

Hanamachi has not been cited to cure this deficiency of Xu, Frankel, and Patadia, but to teach providing a removable, detachable pedestal slip cover. (See Final Rejection of December 15, 2008,

page 6.) As such, the cited portions of the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi, as applied by the Examiner, do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 and allow issuance of the pending claims.

III. Rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi as applied to Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 and in further view of Applicants' admitted prior art. As established above, the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claim 1. The Examiner has not cited Applicants' admitted prior art to cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination but to teach an aluminum deposition target. (See Final Rejection of December 15, 2008, page 7.) As such, the above cited combination and Applicants' admitted prior art, as applied by the Examiner, does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for amended independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 3 and allow issuance thereof.

IV. Rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi as applied to Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,656,093 to Burkhardt, *et al.* (hereinafter "Burkhardt"). As established above, the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for amended independent Claim 1. The Examiner has not cited Burkhardt to cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination but to teach the subject matter of dependent Claim 8. (See Final Rejection of December 15, 2008, page 8.) As such, the above cited combination and Burkhardt, as applied by the Examiner, does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 8 and allow issuance thereof.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1, 3-4, and 8-9.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned agent of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



Steven J. Hanke
Registration No. 58,076

Dated: February 16, 2009

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800